

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated October 28, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-13 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 10 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 4, 11 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,403,616 to Hattori et al. (hereinafter "Hattori") in combination with Japanese Patent Publication No. 08-031830 (hereinafter "830"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with '830' further in combination with Applicant's admitted state of the art.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with '830' is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "the master is separated from the substrate by a few micrometers (μm) during filling the resist in opening of the master." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner stated that "distance of separation" is a "result effective variable" which can be optimized through routine experimentation as to the desired distance require to produce the desired result.

However, Applicant did not agree with the Examiner's statement. In the claimed invention, the resist is formed on the substrate in the thickness of few micrometers. However, in '830' a bump is formed in the thickness of a few hundred micrometers. Thus, the distance between the master and the substrate is few micrometers in the claimed invention, while the distance between the mask and the substrate is a few hundred micrometers in '830'. If the master is apart from the substrate in the distance of few hundreds micrometers in the claimed intention, it is impossible to from the resist in the desired position on the substrate since the

distance between the master and the substrate is too long comparing with the thickness of the resist.

In other words, if the distance between the master and the substrate is longer than a few micrometers, the desired resist pattern for forming patterns of the liquid crystal display device cannot be formed on the substrate.

Thus, by filling the resist opening of the master which is apart from the substrate by a few micrometers, the unexpected result is obtained in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Further, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above-noted feature of the claimed invention of newly-amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 10 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "the master is separated from the substrate by a few micrometers (μm) during filling the resist in opening of the master." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 10 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 10, and Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Claim 12 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "the master is separated from the substrate by a few micrometers (μm) during filling the resist in opening of the master." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 12, and

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Claim 13 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with '830' further in view of Applicant's admitted state of the art is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 5 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant